

**TITLE: The main philosophical problem of 21<sup>th</sup> century Turkish democracy: nationality and cosmopolitanism****CORRESPONDING AUTHOR: Faig ALEKBEROV****Assoc. Prof., Dr. Azerbaijan National Academy of Sciences, Institute of Philosophy and Law,  
Department of Philosophy and History of Social Thought, Azerbaijan, Baku,**

**Abstract.** People who can't produce ideas that are dominant in their memory until yesterday, who can't create new ones yet, and who are influenced by ideas that are completely contradictory to each other, can often find one ideological attraction at a certain period, and then another. In this sense, any idea cannot be strengthened in the consciousness of the majority of society for several years or even ten years. It may take decades for the formation of a single national consciousness in a country. Otherwise, in a short time, ideological or national ideology can be "created" or "superiority" can come to the fore only by means of certain power and influence. If this emerging idea was not based in people's heads and convincingly, but found a place for it through difficult and various means of interaction, then the society could not easily turn its back on it later. We have seen this in the person of the "Soviet nation" ideology. Therefore, when putting forward any national idea, it is the most important factor to take into account the preservation of the existence of a nation, not for a certain period, but continuously. It is very difficult to achieve serious achievements in the field of national ideology without national consciousness. In this sense, it would not be correct to talk about the national ideology without discussing the issue of national consciousness and national identity in modern Azerbaijan. Therefore, it is absolutely impossible to do something in the national ideological field by creating a national identity by passing from the "Soviet nation" mentality to the national mentality. In our opinion, in exceptional cases, only this kind of national idea - national originality, national idea can be enough, even without the help of other ideas, it can turn into a national ideology. However, it cannot go without saying that it is very difficult. The main reason for this is that national wealth and nationalism are often interpreted as reactionary nationalism, that is, chauvinism. In this sense, as much as it is a positive situation for a nation in a colonial state to participate in the struggle for national freedom based on its national identity, it is considered negative for a nation that has gained independence to continue to apply this idea.

**Keywords:** Turkish democracy, Turkish philosophy, National communism, National democracy, Globalization, Turkish Modernism, Citizen Society.

**INTRODUCTION**

Currently, the globalization process occupies a special place among the factors that seriously affect the national consciousness of the Turkish people. Many believe that the main ideas of globalization are modernization, postmodernization, democracy, liberalism and civil society. In our opinion, all of these can form an international consciousness in Turkish thought at best, and a cosmopolitan consciousness at worst. When these ideas are applied, the rights and freedoms of all

people, regardless of race or religion, are emphasized, so nationality is relegated to the background. In particular, the recent promotion of the concepts of civil society, multiculturalism, information society and tolerance as an integral part of the globalization process is very thought-provoking. It seems to us that we should be extremely careful about the issues that are introduced into our consciousness within the ideas that are deceptive and seemingly positive in the sense of the globalization process (for example, the freedom of the individual is superior to the freedom of the nation and the state), but are not in accordance with our national and religious spirituality.

In an era where globalization is widespread in the world and calls are made for the establishment of a modern and civil society, it is natural that the issue of the importance of Islamism and Turkism is of particular interest. In general, there are two main views on Turkification and Islamization in the globalization process: 1) Western-oriented civil society and modernization are more important than Turkification and Islamization; 2) No matter how necessary the establishment of a Western-oriented civil society and modernization is, Turkification and Islamization should not be overshadowed by it.

today , there is at least a two-sided struggle in the formation of national consciousness. Depending on which side wins this struggle, the process of forming national consciousness may take on a new hue. More precisely, if it is concluded that civil society and modernization are more important than Turkification and Islamization, or if it is, then national consciousness may deviate significantly from its essence. Because the consciousness formed on civil society is more international, in a certain sense cosmopolitan consciousness. On the other hand, the attitude towards civil society itself and the form of its application are not unambiguous. Thus, if the civil society model is applied in the true sense of the word, it can be reconciled with national consciousness in a certain sense. However, if this happens formally, the matter takes on a completely different color.

#### **A- INTERNATIONAL “NATIONAL” IDEAS**

Each nation approaches international ideas (liberalism, democracy, civil society, etc.) from the perspective of its own customs, traditions and culture. In this case, depending on the level of development of the nation's national consciousness, the coexistence of international ideas and national ideas is also possible. In this sense, the concepts of national democracy, national liberalism, and national social democracy have also found their place in political and ideological literature. Therefore, it is possible to give any idea, including civil society, considered an international idea a "national" look (Russian Bolshevism, German National Socialism-Fascism, American democracy, English liberalism, Swedish socialism, etc.).

However, it should not be forgotten that nationalizing international ideas has never been met with an unambiguous response. In particular, the "lefts" and the "rights" have been against the nationalization of international ideas. Thus, according to the "lefts", the nationalization of democracy, liberalism and similar ideas undermines their human essence. That is, it leads to their estrangement from their true essence. Undoubtedly, the "lefts" are right to a certain extent in this matter. Because at this time, instead of solving existing problems, the government in any country may try to deceive the world and its own society under the guise of "national democracy". Going a little deeper, the ruling power may declare that the democracy of each nation corresponds to its customs, traditions and culture. In this sense, other countries cannot interfere in our internal affairs, etc.

By the way, the "right" does not accept international ideas as unambiguously as the "left". According to the "right", the provisions reflected in international ideas should not be sought outside, but in the customs and traditions of the nation itself, or in religious values. In particular, according to those who speak from a religious point of view, Christianity and Islam are themselves international ideas. For example, according to Muslim religious figures, many of the provisions

related to democracy, liberalism, and a patriotic society are found in the Quran. Therefore, there is no need to apply such ideas, which are products of the West, in Muslim countries. In this sense, - Salahaddin Khalilov's views on the globalization process are very meaningful: "The processes taking place now under the name of globalization are actually accompanied by the absolutization of a unipolar world and the alignment of national states under a single flag, the suppression of other languages by one language, other political will by one political will, and other economic interests by one language" (*Khelilov, 2009: 22*).

In our opinion, the attitude of the forces that came out of the national-democratic ideology to international and national ideas was more objective. Thus, the forces representing the national-democratic ideology tried to find common ground between the "left" - radical international and "right" - conservative ideas in order to express and preserve their national existence. In particular, depending on their religious identity, individual nations (French, Arab, Turkish, German, Japanese, etc.) tried to take a central position in these issues. However, this remains one of the most serious problems in all periods, including the 20th century and now.

In this regard, in the current era of widespread globalization, it is very difficult to take a central position between the "lefts" and the "rights". In particular, it is not an easy task to find a compromise between the ideas of modernization, postmodernization, and homeland society and the ideas of Shiism, Wahhabism, nationalism, and Alawism. In this sense, if it is possible to talk about "national democracy" and "national socialism" in any relative form, at first glance, "national civil society" and "national modernization" do not correspond to logic and thinking. However, it is not excluded that someone will claim this. It is even possible that the ruling power in any society will want to implement the "national civil society" model. In particular, if the ruling political power in that society is interested in this, "national civil society" can also "be realized".

By the way, when discussing "civil society", the idea that if a US-style civil society is implemented in any society, local customs and traditions and national peculiarities should be taken into account is a sign of moving towards the so-called "national civil society" model. This raises the question of how right it is to hastily implement the "national civil society" model in a society that cannot completely get rid of the "Soviet civil society" mentality and, moreover, has an incomplete national consciousness?

In our opinion, in order to know the clear answer to this question, it is necessary to pay attention to two similar examples that were implemented in a different form at one time: 1) the idea of socialism-communism; 2) the idea of democracy. It is interesting that one of these two international ideas - the ideology of communism - was implemented in the world through violence, and the other - democracy - on the basis of voluntariness. It seems to us that by analyzing the way these two examples were implemented in Azerbaijan, we can come to a certain conclusion about the model of "national civil society" (*Elekberov, 2014: 217-218*).

## B- COMMUNISM AND "NATIONAL COMMUNISM"

First, let us pay attention to the issue of how communism was implemented in Azerbaijan and other former USSR territories. After the Russian Bolsheviks seized power in Russia in 1917, they initially promised freedom to all nations, even declaring it in writing, but soon they began to use the ideology of communism as an occupation policy. However, realizing the impossibility of implementing this only unilaterally, that is, internationally, the Russian Bolsheviks began to give communism a "national form". In other words, they tried to clothe the idea of socialism in a "national" form in order to instill the ideology of communism of Marx and Engels into the minds of other nations in accordance with Russian national interests. The Russian Bolsheviks explained the "national" essence of the ideology of communism as follows: national in form, socialist in content. Their goal in clothing the idea of communism in a "national" form was to confuse and enslave the minds of non-Russian nations. In other words, the Russian Bolsheviks wanted to convince non-

Russian nations, especially the Turkic peoples, by force or pleasure, that a socialist revolution had taken place not only among Russians, but also in the lives of Azerbaijani Turks, Turkestan Turks, Ukrainians and other peoples. It's just that the socialist revolution took place in Russia in one form, in Azerbaijan in another, and in Ukraine in a slightly different form. Supposedly, the reason why socialism took place in other countries (Ukraine, Azerbaijan, Georgia, etc.) in a slightly different form than in Russia was due to the level of readiness of those nations for communism, the structure of their socio-economic formations, the level of consciousness of the masses, in a word, national identity. However, in all cases, supposedly a socialist revolution had taken place in these countries as well, and the workers and peasants had overthrown the national bourgeoisie and seized power.

At that time, the main thing that the Russian Bolsheviks needed was to justify the creation of so-called "socialist states" in the national states they had destroyed with their own hands (Ukraine, Azerbaijan, Georgia, etc.). After that, adding the word "national" to those "socialist states" was nothing more than a cover-up for the policy of occupation. At that time, the search for thinkers in literature who were national in form and communist-socialist in content (Nizami, Nasimi, Akhundzadeh, etc.) was an integral part of that policy. In all cases, "national socialism" on the ground was nothing more than the ideology of Russifying the revolution and restoring the Russian empire.

Perhaps, if the idea of communism of the founders of Marxism had not become an imperial tool in the hands of the Russian Bolsheviks, the attitude towards it in the peoples of the former USSR would not have been so negative. In other words, since the communism of the Marxists was imposed by force by the Russian Bolsheviks, there is irritation towards it in the peoples that were part of the former USSR, including the new generation of the Azerbaijani people (the majority of the older generation approaches this issue differently). In fact, this irritation is more related to "Russian communism" than to the communist ideology of the founders of Marxism. In any case, the teachings put forward by the founders of Marxism contained elements of civil society, which have been emphasized a lot lately. They saw the state as a superstructure, civil society as a material basis, and believed that a communist society without a state could be created. In short, the time will come when law and the state will disappear, and a civil society without power will be created (*Baghirov, 2006: 7*).

In this sense, during the former USSR, in Ukraine, Azerbaijan, Georgia and other colonial countries, under the name of socialism with a "national" character, not the stateless communist society of Marxism, but the "Russian communism" of the Russian Bolsheviks was being built in the true sense of the word. What we mean is that this international idea was not implemented as it should have been due to the imperial interests of the Russian Bolsheviks. In any case, the idea of communism (stateless civil society) put forward by the founders of Marxism was essentially very different from "Russian communism". Thus, the minds of the peoples of the former USSR were instilled not with the idea of communism of the founders of Marxism, but with the idea of "Russian communism" of Lenin and Stalin, and moreover, some "national" features were added to it. Thus, a new public consciousness was formed in the minds of the peoples of the former USSR regarding communism. Such a consciousness in which a citizen could perceive himself neither as a communist nor in a national sense. Thus, the peoples of the former USSR were increasingly Russified under the guise of "Soviet civil society" and "communism." This created an inferiority complex and a sense of slavery in the minds of non-Russian nations.

This meant that for those who were already in power (Russian Bolsheviks), societies that were easy to govern (Ukrainian, Azerbaijani, Georgian, Kazakh, etc.). The main point here is that the rulers (Russian Bolsheviks), while continuing the path of their imperial predecessors (Russian absolutists during the Tsarist period), were also thinking about their successors. Thus, taking into account the possibility of the collapse of the USSR one day, they also drew up plans to keep the societies that had been transformed into nations governed during the Soviet period under constant pressure for those who continued imperial thinking in the future (for example, "Russian

Eurasianism” can now be an example of this). In our opinion, the spread of “Russian Eurasianism” in the post-Soviet space at a time when the peoples of the former USSR were under psychological pressure not from the communism of the founders of Marxism, but from the “Russian communism” of the Bolsheviks, the bearers of Russian imperial thinking, is a very clever idea. Because in Russia they understand very well that the peoples of the former USSR are moving away from Soviet ideology every year, and this moving away means a new generation and a new way of thinking. The new generation's gradual denial of the Soviet generation is completely contrary to the thinking of the Russian empire.

Therefore, the new Russian ideologists are trying to implement “Russian Eurasianism” without leaving the historical stage of the Soviet generation, which responded to imperial thinking among the peoples of the former USSR. They understand very well that if another 10 or 20 years come after the past 20 years, the peoples of the former USSR will not let go of the new generation of Russian imperial thinking. From this point of view, for Russian ideologists, Eurasianism is a means of continuing imperial thinking. Forming a national consciousness against the imperialist idea of “Eurasianism” and coming up with a national idea is an alternative to it. In our opinion, whether the imperialists or supporters of nationalism will win this process will depend a lot on the direction in which public consciousness develops - towards imperial thinking or towards national consciousness.

### **C- DEMOCRACY AND NATIONAL DEMOCRACY**

Unlike the idea of communism (socialism), there are many contradictions between the new generation of the peoples of the former USSR, including the Azerbaijani people, and the Soviet generation in relation to democracy. While the new generation is very inclined towards democracy, the vast majority of the Soviet generation does not accept it or does not want to. Undoubtedly, these are primarily related to public consciousness and public psychology. In other words, depending on the level of public consciousness, the attitude towards democracy is not unambiguous. For example, the Soviet era and conditions, Soviet ideology are the basis for the positive attitude towards "Russian communism" instead of the antipathy of the majority of the Soviet generation towards democracy. It cannot be otherwise.

In particular, the fact that a large part of the Soviet generation, when it comes to communism, refers not to the communism of the founders of Marxism, but to "Russian communism" is more related to the realities and realities of the era than to the idea. This can no longer be a manifestation of voluntary love for the idea. Here, violence and the process of transforming that violence into "love" are clearly manifested. As a result, a large part of the Soviet generation cannot actually forget "Russian communism", and because they cannot forget, they treat democracy as an element of capitalism. In their opinion, democracy means anarchy and arbitrariness. All these are only negative factors for the majority of the Soviet generation.

However, the attitude of the new generation, that is, those who have little or no connection with the Soviet environment, towards democracy, including national democracy, is significantly different. This also main reason there is :

- 1) « Russian from the ideology of " communism " , Soviet from the environment quite a lot different one in the circumstances their growth and to democracy transition , or democracy construction during their lives ;
- 2) In Azerbaijan democracy traditions , especially Azerbaijan Republic during the period national democracy ideas with acquaintance .

The first , in our opinion , is " Russian Communism » ( Soviet ) ideology in the environment immature , him not seeing , or also very less seeing actual as impact circle less which new generation « Russian communism » and to democracy attitude Soviet of the generation from the representative quite a lot degree also is different . The most at least new period of the generation in



his mind bad and good difference doesn't , « Russian communism » fantasy and Soviet internationalism ideology None . Other from the side every one young bad and good lived of the era , environment , education and of culture It is true that new of generation between also those there is that the word real in the sense of democracy , national democracy their concepts understanding They don't . But so youth « Russian about communism » also imaginations to say it will be that no This is the level of in the sense , that of young people also of imagination democracy , national democracy in favor of orientation hope there are many .

Second , the new of generation Soviet from his/her descendants different as average from school starting general in the way also if yes , democracy and national democracy their concepts to master chances There is . With a longing , " Azerbaijan in the subject of " history " democracy and national of democracy In Azerbaijan formation and development they see . The same in time , new of generation empire colonialism in the environment and in education not , independent Azerbaijan in the environment and in education this concepts appropriation also important For example , Azerbaijan Republic during the period nationalist with the democrats acquaintance , their of ideas study new of generation of consciousness in the formation quite a lot to the extent positive impact shows . New generation understands that ( all unless also ) , near in history democracy and « Russian communism » what in relation their father - grandfathers which one way They caught it ! So , the Soviet from his/her descendants different as new of generation this ideas comparison to do chances also there is .

What we saw like , XX in the century international idea which two idea to the line in relation Soviet and new generation between what until contradictions available . This kind contradictions existence , moreover modernization , postmodernization and citizen society of ideas also spread one in the period national consciousness easy in the way formation process out holding possible It 's been a year . at least to him/her according to that Azerbaijan people « Russian from communism » completely saved national democracy incompatible one in the era , new of ideas also to the effect exposed It remains . and , whether you like it or not national consciousness formation to the process obstacle It happens .

National consciousness formation process delay in the background , to this alternative as In the Turkic peoples edge ideas and to him/her suitable non - national consciousness forms society separately to the layers this and either other to the extent impact shows . Because national consciousness any at the level not present people whether you want it or not alternative of ideas either to the effect exposed remains , or also themselves edge to ideas tendency This is especially true young one state for very It is dangerous .

In our opinion , all of these in the background , that is Turkic peoples public in mind to him/her close which national - religious with ideas ( Turkism , Islamism ) and international ideas ( communism , democracy , liberalism ) etc . ) between fight where he went one in the period society citizen to society what to the extent ready whether or not issue very It is controversial . in words so expression to do it will be that the people citizen to society ready , even to some according to , already citizen society during We live ! Of course , from time to time before this kind rules to remove true is not . Above also note what we did like , once upon a time communism about also the same judgments was removed . However then known happened that , not only we communism during we lived , on the contrary that one period military dictatorship from the regime other one thing has not been .

That's right , we we agree that the citizen society and communism different are ideas . To him according to also , these between equality sign to put is wrong . However to the issue more objective and scientific from the direction if we approach we will see that any positive idea so on time and certain evolution based on application if it is not done , it to society damage gives . This in the sense , communism his/her own negative to its aspects although , certain from evolution then out if it were held , the same in time Russian empire of your interests to the instrument if it hadn't turned , situation certain until also if it is different be could . A in other words , any in case formality

and of laws paper on stay what communism , what democracy , what also citizen society essence with closed It is not . In particular , it is not a fiction . communism period lived of the peoples , again fiction citizen society , or also fiction democracy period of living what meaning is there ?

To say what we want main issue it is that society consciousness first democracy , citizen to society to root , to root original the essence to deliver more then to him/her passage to do This is necessary . and all in cases national consciousness normal at the level which societies for characteristic be can . Us so income that Azerbaijan society every two in case – both democratic thinking preparation , both also national consciousness top at the level to be in terms of for now , that's it ready It is not .

Of course , this the opposite claim those who do also be maybe , even waists there is also . However this in thought of those who quite a lot part of in this what to the extent objective to be and to science justification himself also unambiguous It is not .

This in terms of formal as citizen society provisions to the constitution to drop even , real of your life some in the fields application to do It is possible . However public consciousness in terms of this understanding , its the essence of with reality reflection very is different . We one thing one in the form because , even sincere in the way out to hold intending also be We can . But of the crowd the majority him/her understanding If not , understand. did not do provisions blind - blindly reception if it does , this citizen to society passage not , but oneself is to deceive . If claim if it is done that the citizen in society people to the laws according to not , but to humanity according to movement they do , this time of the crowd of consciousness level of laws on top should be . However past USSR of the peoples in the majority of the laws existence in the conditions so people the majority realities different in the way they value .

In particular , Azerbaijan in society democracy and citizen society about, of the word real in the sense of , completely and wide imagination There is no . This issue with closed more very theories and informative information advantage organize All these , yet citizen society to say This is not in terms of democracy , citizen society with their theories , to them related with provisions one society real life , national unique features between immediately equality sign to put is wrong . Because national consciousness normal at the level unformed one in society edge with ideas closed available which of imagination himself also unfinished It happens . This incompleteness people public in mind incompleteness complex creates . Every in case , Azerbaijan society public in mind unfinished democracy , unfinished communism ( social democracy ) , unfinished liberalism , unfinished citizen society , unfinished Islamism , unfinished Turkism , half-breeding Azerbaijaniness is the judge . That is we have all of these of all there is , but unfinished in the form of . All this incompleteness while Azerbaijan in society national consciousness to the formation opportunity does not give . Close two century during national memory entangled one society this solution without doing every which one one new social - economic to the formation , he including citizen to society transformation to be possible is not . First national memory consciousness recovery should be done , more then some new one model to the application attempt must be shown . If national memory consciousness recovery without being to society new one model offer if it is done , society various layers to him/her different reactions they will give .

In this sense, the reforms currently being implemented under the name of democracy, civil society, and the rule of law are not being met with unanimous approval by different segments of society. It is true that , in general , this reforms against never who does not come out and of these against to leave himself also meaningless one step would be . But this apparently That's right . Because one from the side national consciousness memory recovery not done , other from the side citizen society model full not understanding one in society whether you want it or not opposite reactions will be created . to know that this opposite reactions first in periods serious in the way himself manifest But time as it passes situation change This can be case , all societies for is valid . That is never one society from this not insured . The nature of these adverse reactions is also not the same. That is opposite reactions society development in terms of positive also , negative also be

can . Looking who , which circles , which in the sense opposite reactions Of course , society healthy thinker brain opposite reactions in the middle which mistakes removed to lift , that is in society before national memory consciousness recovery to make , national - democratic soul to raise and this at the end citizen society with reconciliation by finding is closed . That is national moral values by protecting alongside , of the times contemporary requirements also into account to buy necessary . Turkey has experienced such problems in the past and continues to experience them. Prof. Erol G ng r wrote in his work “ Cultural Change and Nationalism ” that in order to stand against all foreign ideas, Turkish nationalism must be transformed into a national character. In this case, national and religious identity must be the integrity of the national character (*G ng r, 2007: 125-127*) . Hilmi Ziya  lken, in his work “History of Contemporary Thought in Turkey”, has extensively addressed these issues and talked about the danger of Turkish thought dissolving into Western thought (* lken, 2013: 728-730*) .

Currently, unlike the bearers of national consciousness, radical supporters of religious consciousness and international consciousness approach the ideas of democracy and civil society from a completely different perspective. The first democracy , citizen society their ideas soon they did not let go in case , the second while that one ideas too much already idealize . With this also , every two side society inside to themselves supporter to win works . This, very thought-provoking This is a matter of in the sense , national consciousness, citizen society and modernization between similarity and with contradictions besides, religion consciousness and citizen society, modernization between contradiction and similarities also to investigate necessary . Because every one society only ethnic your identity not , the same in time religious your identity also is the carrier . to know that every which one international idea national with features adapt , but religious with identity No. Of course, this on the contrary also be can.

### **Turkishism, civil society and cosmopolitanism**

The victory of the latter in the struggle between social democracy, which was an example of globalization at the beginning of the 20th century , and Turkism and Islamism, indicates the importance of Turkism even today. True, their victory over "Russian Marxism" did not last long, a little later Russian and pro-Russian social democrats came to power in Azerbaijan. They also propagated "Russian communism" under the name of internationalism. However, unlike Turkism and Islamism, the victory of the Russian social democrats was based on violence and false internationalism, so it had no prospects. It was precisely the reliance on violence of Bolshevism, the Russian version of Marxism, that ultimately led to its destruction. Thus , at the end of the 20th century, national ideas were again turned to . It was concluded that a nation cannot exist without national ideas .

It's just that new problems emerged here . This was because it is difficult to achieve anything with populist and illogical slogans without forming the nation's national consciousness . In the early stages of the restoration of our independence, we could move away from populist and illogical slogans , that is, we could form national consciousness . Since we could not convey Turkism and Islamism to the society correctly , the issue of the importance of national ideas or international ideas came to the agenda again . Those debates and discussions continue to this day . The main thing here is to reconcile national spiritual values with modernity, and in this case, as A. Abbasov said, to give priority to the former (Abbasov, 2010: 39). In other words, no matter how necessary modernization is, national spiritual values should always be one step ahead. In this sense, as much as it is necessary to strengthen Azerbaijaniism under the name of modernization, globalization, and internationalism ideas, it is even more necessary to preserve the ideas of Turkism and Islamism. Because the spirit of Turkism and Islamism has always been parallel to renewal.



Today, internationalism manifests itself in Azerbaijan in the form of Western or European democratic ideas. At the same time, our neighboring states, to one degree or another, also influence the consciousness of the nation by flaunting various variants of internationalism.

Today, some researchers and ideologists believe that Turkism and Islamism. It is impossible to speak out in the current circumstances. Today, those who present themselves as democrats, liberals, in a word, supporters of civil society and modernization, put forward this proposition. According to those who think like this, Islamization and Turkization were necessary and necessary at the beginning of the 20th century, but now they are no longer needed. For example, Acad. Ramiz Mehdiyev, on the one hand, evaluates the Azerbaijani nationalism that emerged at the beginning of the last century as a concrete manifestation of Turkism (Mehdiyev, 2001: 196), and on the other hand, does not agree with the idea that Turkism and Islamism are the main elements of the ideology of modern Azerbaijani statehood (Mehdiyev, 2001: 198). In his opinion, since Turkism has already fulfilled its mission and given way to the Azerbaijani national idea, or Azerbaijaniism, it can be spoken of as an heir, or at best, in the sense of cultural and economic cooperation and rapprochement of all Turkic-speaking peoples (Mehdiyev, 2001: 200). This was also said by social democrats and unionists at the beginning of the last century, in a slightly different form. It is interesting that at that time the most prominent proponents of this idea were Marxists (Narimanov, 1971: 190). They believed that there was no place for nation and religion in the construction of socialism. Now, according to some ideologists, nation and religion do not play a significant role in the construction of civil society. Because in civil society, not religious, national, or even class ideologies, but common sense, conscious freedom and responsibility are the basis. In short, the highest value in civil society is not national identity (nation), religious identity (Muslim, Christian), political identity (rightist, leftist, centrist), but man (Baghirov, 2006: 42). In this sense, the civil society model is actually nothing more than a new form of the ideas of liberalists and Marxists.

In our opinion, if the freedom of the individual is given priority over the freedom of the nation and the state in any society, the national and political existence of that society will sooner or later be endangered. Because the more free an individual feels, the less his attachment to the nation and the state he belongs to will be. In this sense, it is not right to compare the freedom of a person with the freedom of the nation and the state, to contrast them. An individual should always consider himself a member of the nation and the state, and in a certain sense, he should be ready to compromise his interests for the sake of the nation and the state. In other words, if there is a party that compromises for the sake of the nation and the state in all cases, it should be an individual. Only in this case can that nation and the state preserve and maintain its national and political existence. Because the existence of the nation is more valuable than the existence of the individual. The individual should be ready to sacrifice himself for the sake of the nation and the state. Only in societies with this awareness do the nation and the state always exist. However, in any society where individuals prioritize their own interests over those of the nation and state and justify this with unlimited human freedom, their future existence is in doubt.

the attempt to revive national and religious values in many European countries where civil society exists, as well as in the USA, is understandable. Because they understand that no matter how valuable a person is and how many freedoms an individual has, he becomes alienated as he moves away from national and religious values. Moreover, this alienation, that is, the individual's moving away from national affiliation and religious values, results in his becoming an international, cosmopolitan (world citizen) and losing the most ordinary human qualities. The same events once took place during the period of fictitious communism. Under the name of the communist ideology, the Russians tried to distance non-Russians, especially the Turkic-Muslim peoples, from national and religious identities, and to some extent they succeeded. However, the Turkic-Muslim peoples were subjected to greater alienation. As a result of this reaction, Chingiz Aitmatov wrote "A Day is Like an Age", Olzhes Suleymanov wrote "Az - ya", Bakhtiyar Vahabzadeh wrote "Latin Language", and "Gulistan".

Even now, under the name of civil society, the human factor is prioritized over national and religious values . In short , the individual is pitted against the nation and religion . Supposedly , the basis of an individual's freedom is only his rights and freedoms . At this time, the attitude towards the nation and religion is relegated to the background , as it was during the USSR . Here, the main priority is given to the rights and freedoms of the individual , the importance of establishing social relations between people outside the state is discussed , etc. As we have noted above , although such a civil society model seems positive on the one hand in terms of ensuring human rights and freedoms , it generally leads to the disappearance of family values, thereby collapsing the social - institutions that form the basis of the state . This is actually a source of danger for the existence of the state itself in the future . In such a case , the transformation of a person - an individual who is far from national and religious values - into a world homeland loses its meaning . Because the individual loses his essence and falls into an uncertain state , in other words, he becomes alienated .

Therefore , it is not convincing that the individual has a human dignity above his national identity and religious values . This has never been justified . In this sense , those who currently speak of the necessity of civil society under the name of the importance of individual freedom demonstrate , in a certain sense , the same position as the Marxists who criticized the idea of the "trinity" at the beginning of the 20th century . In this sense, the " Marxists " and " liberalists " of the present era do not differ much from those who held such a position at the beginning of the 20th century . In general, those who do not consider Turkism and Islamism as the main ideas of society today , and the Marxists and liberalists of the 20th century, are united by one goal : to keep modern-spirited Islamism and Turkishness in the shade , or to eliminate it altogether . Those who think the opposite are those who defend modern-spirited Turkism and Islamism.

**By the way** , at the beginning of the last century Those who defend Turkism and Islamism emphasized the spirit of modernity in Islamism and Turkism in order to reduce the influence of international - global ideas on national ideas . In this sense , they added modernity to Islamism and Turkism . Although this modernity was at first glance associated with Western culture , the main goal was to highlight the contemporary spirit of Turkism and Islamism . From this perspective The expressions of our intellectuals who spoke out of Turkism and Islamism , “ I have a European appearance ” , “ I am from Western culture ” , are harmonized with the modern spirit of Turkism and Islamism , thereby aiming to neutralize the ideas of globalization (Hüseynzade, 2007: 255) . Because at the beginning of the 20th century , as it is now , the ideas of Westernization , liberalism , and social democracy were widespread . In order to somehow “neutralize ” these international ideas , our national ideologists tried to highlight the contemporary spirit of Islamism and Turkism (Gökalp, 2005: 25-30) . In our opinion , they have done very successful work in this , that is, in reconciling national ideas with international ideas in the form of the superiority of the former . The result of taking such a line is The Republic of Azerbaijan, the first national democratic state in the Turkic - Islamic world, was established .

Even at that time, the concept of citizenship began to emerge. By “citizen” was meant all people living in the territory of the Republic of Azerbaijan and considering themselves as members of this country. This was in a way close to the concept of “citizen” used in European countries. In this sense, the first examples of a “ citizen society” that was Western in nature, but also preserved its national identity, emerged during the period of the Republic of Azerbaijan.

The concept of "Citizen", which was just starting to take shape and find its place in the minds, was labeled "national bourgeois" during the USSR. Its place was taken by the concept of "comrade". When we say "comrade", we mainly mean the working class. The peasants, on the other hand, were valued as a class striving to reach the level of the workers. The main issue was that the concept of "Homeland Stone" remained incomplete. Our goal in writing all this is that, as in the early 20th century, it is necessary to approach international ideas and globalization processes from the line taken by national ideologists, but to act in accordance with the requirements of the time. In other words, it is very wrong to understand surrendering to international, global ideas as a

necessity of the globalization process and civil society. Because without national ideas, any international or global ideas have no significance. Moreover, the leadership of international national ideas and the shadowing of national ideas is very dangerous for any nation. One factor must be taken into account here, that international ideas have usually been used by one nation to dominate other nations. For example, Shiism in Iran, Ottomanism in the Ottoman Empire, Bolshevism in Russia, etc. are clear examples of this. Therefore, nations with weak statehood traditions, little experience of independence, and incompletely formed national consciousness are more affected by processes such as internationalism and globalization.

### **CONCLUSION**

Even today, there are those who see Turkism as an obstacle to the development of Turkey, Azerbaijan and other Turkic states, and even, supposedly, to liberalism, modernization and democracy. All this is nothing more than falsifying the essence of Turkism. Even at the beginning of the 20th century, our thinkers Y. Akçuraoglu, Z. Gökalp, A. Ağaoğlu, A. Hüseyinzade, M. A. Rasulzade and other scientifically and theoretically substantiated that Turkism is not contrary to liberalism and democracy, but on the contrary, coincides with them. In this regard, those who consider Turkism to be contrary to liberalism, democracy and modernization in any sense either do not know the true essence of the issue, or deliberately put forward such arguments.

It should not be forgotten that at all times and even now, if we do not take into account certain exceptions, in each state its leading core has been mainly one nation. Other ethnic minorities, however, have participated or are participating to one degree or another in the structure of those states due to their certain influence. Even if two separate nations played the same role in the formation and current state of a state (Switzerland, Canada, Belgium, etc.), this has been reflected in the Constitution of that state (national language, etc.). That is, in every developed state, they understand that in addition to having equal rights and freedoms in the state they live in, regardless of their citizenship, citizenship, language, or ethnic affiliation, they cannot ignore the national identity and national language of a nation that constitutes the majority in this country. In this sense, it is natural that the national language and national identity of the Azerbaijani Turks living in the Republic of Azerbaijan and the Turkish Turks living in Turkey are reflected in the Constitution in some form. In our opinion, it is not correct to evaluate this as a chauvinistic policy against ethnic minorities or a threat to statehood. Therefore, instead of reconciling national Turkism and democratic ideas with each other, on the contrary, presenting them as completely alternative to each other is very dangerous for the present and future of Azerbaijan, Turkey and other Turkic states. Azerbaijan, Turkey, Kazakhstan, etc. When we say national idea in Turkic states, we should not mean a cosmopolitan or vague idea, but national spirit ideas based on Turkism, patriotism, statehood, Islamism, modernization should be put forward. In other words, we should draw the right conclusions from the changes taking place in our national consciousness, expect scientific objectivity when talking about the succession between the past and the present, or the restoration of national consciousness, and stay away from artificial, cosmopolitan thoughts.

### **References**

1. Abbasov Abulhasan. The role of Heydar Aliyev's heritage in the formation of national ideology. Baku, "Science and Education", 2010, 424 p.
2. Bağırov Shahn. Political aspects of civil society formation in Azerbaijan. Baku, 2006, « MBM », 124 p.
3. Historical-philosophical view of the problem of national ideology (Part II). Baku, "Science and Education", 2014, 500 p.

4. Gökalp Z. Turkification, Islamization, modernization. Istanbul, Aquarium, 2005.
5. Gungor Erol. Cultural Change and Nationalism. Istanbul. Otügen. 2007
6. Helilov SS Dialogue between civilizations. Baku, "Adiloğlu" publishing house, 2009, 252 p.
7. Huseyinzade E. Selected works. Baku, "East-West", 2007, 480 p.
8. Mehdiyev R.A. Azerbaijan: historical heritage and philosophy of independence. Azerbaijan National encyclopedic Publishing House, 2001, 276 p.
9. Narimanov Nariman. Articles and speeches. In volume II, volume I, Baku, Azernashr, 1971, 267 p.
10. Ülken Hilmi Zia. History of Contemporary Thought in Turkey. Istanbul. Your country. 2013

**Research Article**  
“21th Turkish Democracy – Faig Alekberov”



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

**IMCRA - International Meetings and Journals Research Association**

[www.imcra-az.org](http://www.imcra-az.org); E-mail (Submission & Contact): [editor@imcra-az.org](mailto:editor@imcra-az.org)

Science, Education and Innovations in the context of modern problems - ISSN:  
2790-0169 / 2790-0177



DOI prefix

10.56334/sei